

1 Jonathan W. Fountain
2 Nevada Bar No. 10351
3 JFountain@LRLaw.com
4 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP
5 3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Ste. 600
6 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996
7 Tel.: 702.949.8340
8 Fax: 702.949.8374

9
10 E. Leif Reid
11 Nevada Bar No. 5750
12 LReid@LRLaw.com
13 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP
14 50 West Liberty St., Ste. 410
15 Reno, NV 89501-1922
16 Tel.: 775.321.3415
17 Fax: 775.823.2929

18 Josh Krevitt (admitted *pro hac vice*)
19 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
20 200 Park Avenue
21 New York, NY 10166-0193
22 Tel.: 212.351.4000
23 Fax: 212.351.4035

24 H. Mark Lyon (admitted *pro hac vice*)
25 Y. Ernest Hsin (admitted *pro hac vice*)
26 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
27 1881 Page Mill Road
28 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1211
29 Tel.: 650.849.5300
30 Fax: 650.849.5333

31 Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.

32
33
34 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
35
36 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

37 UNWIRED PLANET LLC, a Nevada
38 limited liability company,

39 Plaintiff,

40 vs.

41 APPLE INC., a California corporation,

42 Defendant.

43 Case No. 3:12-CV-00505-RCJ-VPC

44
45 **DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S**
46 **MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE**
47 **PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)**

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	I.	INTRODUCTION	1
3	II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND	2
4	A.	Apple and Its Potential Witnesses Are Based and Located in the Northern District of California.....	3
5	B.	Unwired Planet Has a History of Contacts with the Northern District of California and Lacks Significant Contacts with the District of Nevada	4
6	C.	The Majority of Non-Party Witnesses Are Located in Northern California – None Are in Nevada	5
7	1.	Most of the Inventors Reside in Northern California – None Reside in Nevada.....	5
8	2.	Most of the Individuals Accused of Inequitable Conduct Reside in Northern California – None Are in Nevada.....	6
9	3.	Most of the Counsel Who Prosecuted the Patents Are Located in Northern California – None Are in Nevada.....	6
10	4.	Numerous Relevant Former Unwired Planet Employees Reside in Northern California – None Reside in Nevada.....	7
11	III.	ARGUMENT.....	8
12	A.	This Action Could Have Been Brought in the Northern District of California	8
13	B.	The Private Factors Overwhelmingly Favor Transfer	9
14	1.	The Parties Have Far Greater Contacts with the Northern District of California	9
15	2.	The Contacts Relating to the Causes of Action Are Located in the Northern District of California	13
16	3.	Ease of Access to Sources of Proof Strongly Favors the Northern District of California	15
17	4.	Many Non-Party Witnesses Would be Subject to Compulsory Process in the Northern District of California – None Would Be in the District of Nevada.....	17
18	5.	The Cost of Litigation Will Be Far Less in the Northern District of California	18
19	6.	Unwired Planet’s Choice of Forum Is Entitled to Little, If Any, Weight.....	18
20	C.	The Applicable Public Factors Favor Transfer	20
21	D.	The Remaining Private and Public Factors Are Neutral or Not Applicable	20
22	IV.	CONCLUSION	21

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
2	Cases
3	
4	<i>Convergence Technologies (USA) v. Microloops Corporation</i> , 711 F. Supp. 2d 626 (E.D. Va. 2010) 12
5	<i>Dainippon Screen Manufacturing Co. v. CFMT, Inc.</i> , 142 F.3d 1266 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 12
6	<i>GPNE Corp. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. 11-00426 SOM-RLP, 2012 WL 1656923 (D. Haw. May 9, 2012) 15, 16, 19
7	<i>Healy v. Philips</i> , 69 F.3d 544 (9th Cir. 1995) 8
8	<i>Hertz Corp. v. Friend</i> , 559 U.S. 77, 130 S.Ct. 1181 (2010) 12
9	<i>In re Acer America Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1252 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 17
10	<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 15, 16
11	<i>In re Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 12
12	<i>In re Link A Media Devices Corp.</i> , 662 F.3d 1221 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 13
13	<i>In re Microsoft Corp.</i> , 630 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 10, 12, 20
14	<i>In re Nintendo Co., Ltd.</i> , 589 F.3d 1194 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 16
15	<i>In re TS Tech USA Corp.</i> , 551 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 15
16	<i>In re Verizon Business Network Services</i> , 635 F.3d 559 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 18
17	<i>In re Volkswagen of America, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008) 15, 16
18	<i>In re Zimmer</i> , 587 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 10, 12
19	<i>Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc.</i> , 211 F.3d 495 (9th Cir. 2000) 8, 9
20	<i>Koster v. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co.</i> , 330 U.S. 518, 67 S.Ct. 828, 91 L.Ed. 1067 (1947) 13
21	<i>Lockman Foundation v. Evangelical Alliance Mission</i> , 930 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1991) 19
22	<i>Neil Bros. Ltd. v. World Wide Lines, Inc.</i> , 425 F. Supp. 2d 325 (E.D.N.Y. 2006) 15
23	<i>Osteotech, Inc. v. GenSci Regeneration Sciences, Inc.</i> , 6 F. Supp. 2d 349 (D.N.J. 1998) 19

1	<i>Pacific Car & Foundry Co. v. Pence</i> , 403 F.2d 949 (9th Cir. 1968).....	19
2	<i>Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 769 F. Supp. 2d 991 (E.D. Va. 2011)	20
3	<i>Ricoh Co., Ltd. v. Honeywell, Inc.</i> , 817 F. Supp. 473 (D.N.J. 1993)	15
4	<i>Ruiz v. Affinity Logistics</i> , No. C 05-02015JSW, 2005 WL 5490240 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2005).....	16
5	<i>Saleh v. Titan Corp.</i> , 361 F. Supp. 2d 1152 (S.D. Cal. 2005).....	16
6	<i>Shared Memory Graphics LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 5:09CV5128 BSM, 2010 WL 5151612 (W.D. Ark. May 27, 2010)	11
7	<i>Unwired Planet LLC v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. 3:12-cv-00504-LRH-VPC (Sept. 19, 2012).....	4, 9
8	<i>Ventress v. Japan Airlines</i> , 486 F.3d 1111 (9th Cir. 2007).....	13

Statutes

12	28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(2).....	9
13	28 U.S.C. § 1391(d)	9
14	28 U.S.C. § 1400(b)	9
	28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)	1, 8, 21

Rules

¹⁶ Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(b)(2) 18

1 Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”) respectfully moves this Court, pursuant to 28
 2 U.S.C. § 1404(a), for an Order transferring this action to the United States District
 3 Court for the Northern District of California. This Motion is based on the following
 4 Memorandum of Points and Authorities and the declarations and exhibits filed
 5 herewith.

6 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 Every factor considered by the Ninth Circuit in determining proper venue favors
 9 transfer of this case to the Northern District of California. Defendant Apple was
 10 founded and is headquartered in the Northern District of California and has no relevant
 11 particularized ties to Nevada. Plaintiff Unwired Planet LLC was formed in Nevada
 12 literally *days* before this lawsuit was filed and exists *only* to serve as a patent holding
 13 company and lawsuit plaintiff. And Unwired Planet LLC’s parent company, Unwired
 14 Planet, Inc., to whom the Complaint attributes the Asserted Patents, was founded in the
 15 Northern District of California and has conducted business in that District since its
 16 inception in 1994.

17 Not surprisingly, therefore, the relevant, operative facts – including the
 18 conception and commercialization by Unwired Planet of the alleged inventions, the
 19 prosecution of the patents in suit, and the development by Apple of the accused
 20 products – occurred or are occurring in the Northern District of California. As a result,
 21 the vast majority of relevant documents and witnesses – including named inventors of
 22 the patents, prosecuting attorneys, and Apple’s engineers who developed the accused
 23 products – are also located in the Northern District of California.

24 That the Northern District of California is the focal point for the facts and
 25 witnesses is also plainly evidenced by the parties’ discovery efforts in another case that
 26 Unwired Planet, Inc. recently pursued against Apple covering similar accused products
 27 and technologies. Specifically, in 2011, Unwired Planet, Inc. filed suit against Apple
 28 in the U.S. International Trade Commission in Washington, DC. In that case, because

of the convenience of the witnesses and parties, and despite the parties' being free to choose to appear for depositions any place in the country, every single party witness was deposed – including *every single Unwired Planet witness* – in the Northern District of California.

In contrast, this District “enjoys” no unique relationship with Apple and only the following recent, litigation-inspired contacts with Unwired Planet: (1) six days before it filed this lawsuit, Unwired Planet LLC was organized as a limited liability company in this district and (2) on the same day that the lawsuit was filed, Unwired Planet, Inc. announced plans to move from Northern California to Nevada sometime in the future. But both the Ninth Circuit and the Federal Circuit have rejected such transparent efforts to manufacture ties to a district for the purposes of establishing venue. In fact, the courts have routinely and repeatedly ordered transfer even in cases in which the parties had much stronger and lengthier ties to the original jurisdiction than either Unwired Planet LLC or its predecessors, including Unwired Planet, Inc. (collectively “Unwired Planet”), have to the District of Nevada.

Because the relevant factors overwhelmingly favor transfer, Apple respectfully requests that the Court grant this Motion and transfer the case to the Northern District of California.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Unwired Planet filed this lawsuit against Apple on September 19, 2012, alleging that Apple infringes the following ten patents assigned to Unwired Planet: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,317,594; 6,317,831; 6,321,092; 6,532,446; 6,647,260; 6,813,491; 7,020,685; 7,233,790; 7,299,033; and 7,522,927 (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”). Dkt. No. 1, Complaint (“Compl.”) ¶¶ 15-24, 27. The patents relate to a variety of technologies, and Unwired Planet has accused numerous Apple products of infringement, including: Apple’s iPhone, iPad, and iPod touch, Apple’s iOS operating system, Apple App Store and iTunes for iOS, apps available for Apple’s iOS products, notification and location services provided by Apple to its customers (including through Apple’s Safari

1 browser), Siri, and the infrastructure used by Apple to support the aforementioned
 2 systems or services. *Id.* ¶ 27. Development of these products and systems occurred or
 3 occurs in the Northern District of California. Declaration of Mark Buckley (“Buckley
 4 Decl.”) ¶¶ 3-8.

5 As noted above, Unwired Planet has filed other cases against Apple in the past.
 6 In August 2011, Unwired Planet’s parent sued Apple in the U.S. International Trade
 7 Commission (ITC) in Washington, DC, for the alleged infringement of five patents.
 8 Declaration of Brooke Wallace (“Wallace Decl.”) ¶ 3, Ex. 1. At approximately the
 9 same time, Unwired Planet also filed a companion suit to the ITC Investigation in the
 10 District of Delaware. *Id.* ¶ 26, Ex. 16. In those cases, Unwired Planet accused many
 11 of the same products accused in this case – including Apple’s iPhone, iPad, iPod touch,
 12 and Apple’s App Store, iTunes and Safari for iOS. *See id.* ¶ 5. On the eve of trial,
 13 after the administrative law judge issued a claim construction order adopting most of
 14 Apple’s proposed constructions, Unwired Planet dismissed the case in its entirety. *Id.*
 15 ¶ 4, Ex. 2. While the Delaware case was stayed during the ITC Investigation, the stay
 16 was lifted in December 2012.

17 Extensive discovery was taken in the ITC Investigation. Unwired Planet
 18 deposed thirteen Apple fact witnesses; *all* of those depositions took place in the
 19 Northern District of California. *Id.* ¶ 5. Apple also deposed six Unwired Planet
 20 witnesses; Unwired Planet produced all of its witnesses in the Northern District of
 21 California. *Id.* ¶ 6. In the course of the ITC Investigation, which, again, accused many
 22 of the same products at issue in this case, no party produced any witnesses, documents,
 23 or other discovery located in the District of Nevada. *Id.* ¶ 3.

24 **A. Apple and Its Potential Witnesses Are Based and Located in the Northern
 25 District of California**

26 Apple was founded and is still based in Cupertino, California, in the Northern
 27 District of California. *See* Buckley Decl. ¶ 2. Apple currently has more than 13,800
 28 employees working at its headquarters in Cupertino. *Id.* ¶ 5. Based on Apple’s

1 understanding of what is accused in this lawsuit, development of the relevant aspects
 2 of the accused products occurred or is occurring in the Northern District of California,
 3 not in Nevada. *See id.* ¶¶ 3-4, 6-8. To the best of Apple's knowledge (given the early
 4 stage of the case and the lack of infringement contentions), the relevant engineers
 5 involved in the development, implementation, or operation of the accused products are
 6 located in the Northern District of California, not in Nevada. *See id.* To the best of
 7 Apple's knowledge, the documentation relating to the development, implementation,
 8 or operation of the accused products are also located in the Northern District of
 9 California, not in Nevada. *See id.*

10 **B. Unwired Planet Has a History of Contacts with the Northern District of
 11 California and Lacks Significant Contacts with the District of Nevada**

12 On September 13, 2012, six days before this lawsuit was filed, Unwired Planet,
 13 Inc. formed Unwired Planet LLC, the plaintiff in this action, in Nevada. Wallace Decl.
 14 ¶ 12, Ex. 8. Unwired Planet LLC is nothing more than a patent holding company for
 15 the Asserted Patents. *See generally id.* ¶¶ 15, 27; Exs. 11, 17, at 20. It does no
 16 business in Nevada other than prosecuting this lawsuit and another one filed against
 17 Google, Inc. *Id.* ¶ 27, Ex. 17, at 20; *Unwired Planet LLC v. Google, Inc.*, No. 3:12-
 18 CV-00504-LRH-VPC (Sept. 19, 2012). Notably, it is Unwired Planet, Inc. who has
 19 issued every press release and announcement regarding this litigation. *See generally*
 20 *id.* ¶ 15, Ex. 11. In addition, in its Complaint, and again last week, on January 24,
 21 2013, Unwired Planet LLC submitted a Case Management Report in this case claiming
 22 that its "principal place of business" is at 226 California Avenue, Reno, Nevada.
 23 Compl. ¶ 4; Dkt. No. 35. But as of the very next day, January 25, 2013, that location –
 24 *i.e.*, the alleged location in Nevada of the titular plaintiff in this lawsuit – *was nothing*
 25 *but a vacant room*, sitting above an unrelated retail gift shop, *with no actual office*.
 26 Declaration of Danielle Durkee ("Durkee Decl.") ¶ 2. Furthermore, neither Unwired
 27 Planet LLC nor Unwired Planet, Inc. is even licensed to do business in Nevada, as
 28 neither appears currently to have a Reno business license. *Id.* ¶ 3.

1 Although it registered Plaintiff Unwired Planet LLC as a Nevada limited
 2 liability company, Unwired Planet, Inc. is a Delaware corporation, founded in 1994
 3 and based for virtually its entire existence in Redwood City, California, in the Northern
 4 District of California. *See* Compl. ¶ 8; Wallace Decl. ¶¶ 7-12, Exs. 3-8. On September
 5 19, 2012, *the same day* that Plaintiff Unwired Planet LLC filed its complaint against
 6 Apple in Nevada, Unwired Planet, Inc. announced that it intended to move its
 7 headquarters from Redwood City to Reno, Nevada. *Id.* ¶ 13, Ex. 9. Even after that
 8 announcement, however, Unwired Planet, Inc. has still identified its headquarters as
 9 being located in Redwood City or Silicon Valley in certain filings with the Securities
 10 and Exchange Commission and in various press releases. *See id.* ¶ 14, Ex. 10, ¶ 25,
 11 Ex. 15. In addition, Unwired Planet's CEO has admitted in public comments that its
 12 "move" to Nevada was motivated by this (and other) litigations. *See id.* ¶ 15, Ex. 11.

13 **C. The Majority of Non-Party Witnesses Are Located in Northern California**
 14 **— None Are in Nevada**

15 **1. Most of the Inventors Reside in Northern California — None Reside**
 16 **in Nevada**

17 As noted above, Unwired Planet has asserted ten patents against Apple in this
 18 lawsuit. According to the cover page of each patent, which identifies the original
 19 assignee and the location of the named inventors at the time of filing, none of the
 20 assignees or named inventors were located in Nevada at the time of filing; most were
 21 located in the Northern District of California. *Id.* ¶ 17. Indeed, the ten patents list
 22 eighteen inventors, none of whom were ever employed by Plaintiff Unwired Planet
 23 LLC, and none of whom appear to be currently employed at Unwired Planet, Inc. *Id.* ¶
 24 16. Based on publicly available information, it appears that eleven of the eighteen
 25 inventors reside or work in the Northern District of California, six inventors reside in
 26 Washington, Colorado, and Ireland, and one inventor's location is unknown. *Id.* ¶ 17.
 27 Based on available information, moreover, it appears that *none* of the inventors reside
 28 in or are even within the subpoena power of the District of Nevada. *See id.*

1 **2. Most of the Individuals Accused of Inequitable Conduct Reside in**
 2 **Northern California — None Are in Nevada**

3 Apple has asserted inequitable conduct claims against six individuals. Dkt. No.
 4 29 (“Answer”), ¶¶ 9-100. Five of the accused individuals work or reside in the
 5 Northern District of California (Messrs. Kjellberg, Becker, Chen, Schwartz, and
 6 Martin, Jr.), with the sixth individual residing in Bend, Oregon (Mr. King). *See*
 7 Wallace Decl. ¶¶ 17-18. None of the individuals reside in or are within the subpoena
 8 power of Nevada. *See id.*

9 **3. Most of the Counsel Who Prosecuted the Patents Are Located in**
 10 **Northern California — None Are in Nevada**

11 With respect to counsel who prosecuted the Asserted Patents before the U.S.
 12 Patent and Trademark Office, it appears that all of the Asserted Patents, other than the
 13 three acquired by Unwired Planet from third parties, were prosecuted, at least in part,
 14 by counsel located in the Northern District of California. Lawyers from the San
 15 Francisco office of Townsend, Townsend & Crew LLP (now Kilpatrick Townsend &
 16 Stockton LLP) prosecuted the ’927, ’092, and ’033 patents. *Id.* ¶ 19 (Melvin Chan and
 17 Alan Minsk). A lawyer from the Sunnyvale office of Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor and
 18 Zaffman LLP prosecuted the ’033 patent. *Id.* (Jordan Becker). Lawyers from the Los
 19 Angeles office of the same firm prosecuted the ’446 and ’260 patents. *Id.* (Jordan
 20 Becker and Dag Johansen). Both of those Los Angeles lawyers now work and live in
 21 the Northern District of California. *Id.* A lawyer from the Palo Alto office of Beyer,
 22 Weaver & Thomas LLP (now Beyer Law Group LLP) prosecuted the ’831 patent.
 23 *Id.* (C. Douglass Thomas). Lawyers from the Palo Alto office of Stattler, Johansen &
 24 Adeli prosecuted the ’260 patent. *Id.* (Adeli Mani, John Stattler and Dag Johansen).¹

25
 26
 27 ¹ San Francisco, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale, California, are all located in the Northern
 28 District of California.

1 On information and belief, today six of Unwired Planet's former counsel
 2 involved in the prosecutions of the Asserted Patents work, and presumably live, in the
 3 Northern District of California. *See id.* (C. Douglass Thomas, Melvin Chan, Jordan
 4 Becker, Thomas C. Webster, John Stattler, and Dag Johansen). One works outside of
 5 the Northern District of California, but within the state of California, in Los Angeles.
 6 *Id.* (Adeli Mani). The remaining attorneys work in Colorado, Texas, and Washington
 7 State. *Id.* (Michael J. Fogarty, III, Michael A. Papalas, David H. Tannenbaum, Kent
 8 A. Fischmann, Kenneth L. Johnson, Alan Minsk). On information and belief, *none*
 9 reside within the District of Nevada, nor are they within the subpoena power of the
 10 District of Nevada. *See id.*

11 **4. Numerous Relevant Former Unwired Planet Employees Reside in
 12 Northern California — None Reside in Nevada**

13 In 2012, Unwired Planet, Inc. sold its operating businesses (retaining only its
 14 patent portfolio) to two companies in Redwood City, California, and another company
 15 based in India but whose U.S. office is in Santa Clara, California – in the Northern
 16 District of California. Compl. ¶ 14; Wallace Decl. ¶¶ 20, 24, Exs. 12-14. On
 17 information and belief, at least one former Unwired Planet, Inc. employee who has
 18 knowledge of the work that led to or is related to the Asserted Patents is still employed
 19 at one of the companies that acquired Unwired Planet's operating businesses and is
 20 therefore located in the Northern District of California. *Id.*, ¶ 28, Ex. 18.

21 In addition, several other former Unwired Planet employees known to have
 22 relevant knowledge are believed to be located in Northern California. For example,
 23 David Cordeiro, Unwired Planet's former associate general counsel and intellectual
 24 property counsel, lives and works in Northern California. *Id.* ¶ 21. Based on
 25 information learned in the ITC Investigation, it is likely that Mr. Cordeiro possesses
 26 knowledge of patent licenses Unwired Planet entered into during his tenure, which will
 27 be relevant to any damages calculation in this case. Similarly, Bruce Posey, Unwired
 28 Planet's former general counsel, works in San Mateo, California, and is also likely to

1 have knowledge of Unwired Planet's patent licenses. *Id.* ¶ 22. Apple is unaware of
 2 any relevant former Unwired Planet employee who resides in Nevada.

3 **III. ARGUMENT**

4 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), a court may transfer a case to a forum where
 5 the action could have been brought “[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses,
 6 [and] in the interests of justice.” 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a); *Healy v. Philips*, No. 94-56624,
 7 1995 WL 643268, at *1 (9th Cir. Nov. 1, 1995). The Ninth Circuit has identified
 8 several private and public interest factors to determine whether the requirements of
 9 section 1404(a) are satisfied. The private interest factors include “(1) the location
 10 where the relevant agreements were negotiated and executed, (2) the state that is most
 11 familiar with the governing law, (3) the plaintiff’s choice of forum, (4) the respective
 12 parties’ contacts with the forum, (5) the contacts relating to the plaintiff’s cause of
 13 action in the chosen forum, (6) the differences in the costs of litigation in the two
 14 forums, (7) the availability of compulsory process to compel the attendance of
 15 unwilling non-party witnesses, and (8) the ease of access to sources of proof.” *Jones v.*
 16 *GNC Franchising, Inc.*, 211 F.3d 495, 498-99 (9th Cir. 2000). The public interest
 17 factors identified by the courts include “the administrative difficulties flowing from
 18 court congestion; the local interest in having localized controversies decided at home;
 19 the interest in having the trial of a diversity case in a forum that is at home with the law
 20 that must govern the action; the avoidance of unnecessary problems in conflict of laws,
 21 or in the application of foreign law; and the unfairness of burdening citizens in an
 22 unrelated forum with jury duty.” *Id.*

23 **A. This Action Could Have Been Brought in the Northern District of
 24 California**

25 As a threshold matter in deciding section 1404(a) motions, courts consider
 26 whether the action could have been brought in the target transferee district. Apple is
 27 (and was at the time this lawsuit was filed) resident, headquartered, and subject to
 28 personal jurisdiction in the Northern District of California. Unwired Planet cannot

1 dispute, therefore, that it could have filed this action in the Northern District of
 2 California. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c)(2), (d); 1400(b).

3 **B. The Private Factors Overwhelmingly Favor Transfer**

4 **1. The Parties Have Far Greater Contacts with the Northern District of
 5 California**

6 As explained above, both Apple and Unwired Planet have strong and long-
 7 standing ties with the Northern District of California, and no significant ties with the
 8 District of Nevada. Apple was founded and has been headquartered in Cupertino,
 9 California, in the Northern District of California, since 1976. Buckley Decl. ¶ 2.

10 The titular plaintiff in this action, Unwired Planet LLC, has no history or
 11 business in this district other than its creation in September 2012 for this (and another)
 12 patent infringement lawsuit. *See Unwired Planet LLC v. Google, Inc.*, No. 3:12-CV-
 13 00504-LRH-VPC (Sept. 19, 2012). Indeed, Unwired Planet, Inc.’s recent filing with
 14 the Securities and Exchange Commission unambiguously admits that Unwired Planet
 15 LLC conducts *no business at all* other than as a patent holding corporation:

16 Except for owning the Patents contributed to it by UP [Unwired Planet,
 17 Inc.], commencing and conducting the Legal Actions set forth on
 18 Schedule 4.2(e)-1 and the incurrence of expenses in connection therewith
 19 or as otherwise described on Schedule 4.2(e)-2 since its formation,
*UPLLC [Unwired Planet LLC] has (i) conducted no other business,
 operations or activities, (ii) owns no other assets or properties, (iii) has
 no material liabilities or obligations of any kind other than pursuant to
 this Agreement and the Ancillary Agreements to which it is a party and
 (iv) is not a party to or bound by any Contract, other than this Agreement
 and those Contracts described on Schedule 4.2(e)-2 and, upon execution
 and delivery by UPLLC, the Ancillary Agreements to which UPLLC is a
 party.*

23 Wallace Decl., ¶ 27, Ex. 17, at 20 (emphasis supplied). Moreover, even though
 24 Unwired Planet LLC has represented to this Court in its Complaint (Compl., ¶ 4), and
 25 again just days ago, on January 24, 2013, that its “principal place of business” is at a
 26 California Avenue address in Reno (Dkt. No. 35), the next day Apple confirmed that
 27 this location is entirely vacant – Unwired Planet LLC has no office there. Durkee
 28 Decl. ¶ 2.

1 Courts have repeatedly made clear that creation of an entity in a particular
 2 district for purposes of prosecuting litigation in that district is not a basis to resist
 3 transfer. For example, in *In re Microsoft Corporation*, the Federal Circuit ordered
 4 transfer where the plaintiff was incorporated in the original district sixteen days before
 5 filing suit and for the purpose of litigating the case. 630 F.3d 1361, 1364-65 (Fed. Cir.
 6 2011). Similarly, in *In re Zimmer*, the Federal Circuit ordered transfer where the
 7 plaintiff's location of its principal place of business in the original venue was plainly
 8 designed to manipulate venue. 587 F.3d 1378, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (finding the
 9 plaintiff's connection to the original district to be a "legal fiction"). Here, Unwired
 10 Planet LLC's organization in Nevada just six days before the filing of the lawsuit for
 11 the stated purpose of litigation in this District falls squarely under the types of facts
 12 that have been rejected as bases for resisting transfer. *See In re Microsoft*, 630 F.3d at
 13 1364-65 (rejecting the plaintiff's argument that it was entitled to the original venue
 14 simply because it was incorporated and had its principal place of business in the
 15 original district).

16 While Unwired Planet LLC's parent, Unwired Planet, Inc. (not a party),
 17 admittedly is not a brand-new entity created just for litigation, its history and ties all lie
 18 with the Northern District of California, not with the District of Nevada. As noted
 19 above, Unwired Planet, Inc. was founded in Northern California in 1994 and has been
 20 located in that district for almost twenty years. Wallace Decl. ¶¶ 7-11, Exs. 3-7. Thus,
 21 the technologies relating or leading to the Asserted Patents (other than those acquired
 22 by Unwired Planet) were developed while Unwired Planet, Inc. was headquartered and
 23 had its engineering development located in *Northern California*. Compare Compl. ¶¶
 24 15-24 and Wallace Decl. ¶¶ 7-11, Exs. 3-7. Meanwhile, Unwired Planet LLC had no
 25 role in the development of the Asserted Patents. In similar situations, courts have
 26 concluded that the parent's connection with the transferee district outweighed its
 27 subsidiary's connection with the transferor district, even where that subsidiary was
 28 incorporated in the transferor district. *Shared Memory Graphics LLC v. Apple Inc.*,

1 No. 5:09CV5128 BSM, 2010 WL 5151612, *3-4 (W.D. Ark. May 27, 2010) (granting
 2 defendant's motion to transfer to the Northern District of California, where although
 3 plaintiff was incorporated in the transferor district, the plaintiff entity had no role in the
 4 development of the Asserted Patents, and the plaintiff's parent company, which
 5 negotiated and purchased the patents in question before transferring them to the
 6 plaintiff, was headquartered in Southern California, which the court observed was
 7 "considerably closer" to the Northern District of California than to the Western District
 8 of Arkansas).

9 Moreover, no weight should be given to Unwired Planet, Inc.'s recent "move" to
 10 Nevada. First, Unwired Planet, Inc. is not a party to this lawsuit, so its "move" is not
 11 persuasive to the analysis. Second, Unwired Planet, Inc. only announced its "move"
 12 the day this litigation was filed. And third, it is not clear at this point whether Unwired
 13 Planet, Inc.'s recent "move" to Nevada has real substance. For example, Unwired
 14 Planet, Inc. continues to issue press releases out of Redwood City that identify Silicon
 15 Valley as its headquarters. *Id.* ¶ 25, Ex. 15. In addition, it is not clear whether or how
 16 many of Unwired Planet, Inc.'s current employees, including its executive leadership
 17 team, are actually residents of Nevada. *See id.* ¶ 23; *see also* Durkee Decl. ¶ 2. Three
 18 of the four individuals on Unwired Planet, Inc.'s "Executive Leadership" webpage
 19 appear, based on publicly available information, to be located in the San Francisco Bay
 20 Area. Wallace Decl. ¶ 23. All three of those executives were deposed in the just-
 21 concluded lawsuit at the International Trade Commission involving Unwired Planet
 22 and Apple and had their depositions taken in Northern California. *Id.* Furthermore,
 23 neither Unwired Planet LLC nor Unwired Planet, Inc. is even licensed to do business
 24 in Nevada, as neither appears to currently have a Reno business license. Durkee Decl.
 25 ¶ 3. What is clear, however, is that both the organization of Unwired Planet LLC in
 26 Nevada and the public announcement of its parent's "move" to Nevada are motivated
 27 by litigation – facts to which Unwired Planet, Inc.'s CEO has admitted in public
 28 comments. *See* Wallace Decl. ¶ 15, Ex. 1.

1 In sum, Unwired Planet LLC’s organization in Nevada just six days before it
 2 filed this lawsuit and Unwired Planet, Inc.’s “move” to Reno, Nevada, are precisely the
 3 types of litigation-driven maneuvers that courts have rejected as reasons to oppose
 4 transfer to a more convenient forum. *See, e.g., In re Microsoft Corp.*, 630 F.3d at
 5 1364-5; *In re Zimmer Holdings, Inc.*, 609 F.3d at 1381(citing *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*,
 6 559 U.S. 77, 130 S.Ct. 1181, 1195 (2010)(ordering transfer where the plaintiff’s
 7 presence in the original forum was “*recent, ephemeral, and an artifact of litigation*”
 8 (emphasis supplied)); *In re Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc.*, 587 F.3d 1333, 1337 (Fed. Cir.
 9 2009) (“A plaintiff’s attempts to manipulate venue in anticipation of litigation or a
 10 motion to transfer falls squarely within these prohibited activities.”); *Convergence
 11 Techs. (USA) v. Microloops Corp.*, 711 F. Supp. 2d 626, 641-42 (E.D. Va. 2010)
 12 (granting defendant’s motion to transfer to the Northern District of California, where
 13 although the plaintiff was incorporated in the transferor district, the court concluded
 14 that the transferor district was only “nominally” plaintiff’s home forum as the plaintiff
 15 was owned and controlled by a foreign corporation for the purposes of managing the
 16 foreign parent’s U.S. sales); *see also Dainippon Screen Mfg. Co. v. CFMT, Inc.*, 142
 17 F.3d 1266, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (finding that the subsidiary patent holding company,
 18 over which the parent maintained complete control, could not be used as a vehicle to
 19 divert personal jurisdiction from the parent’s home district).

20 In fact, even in situations where *the party seeking transfer* was incorporated in
 21 the original forum *long before* the motion to transfer was filed, the Federal Circuit has
 22 ordered transfer and given minimal weight to the parties’ location of incorporation.
 23 For example, in *In re Link_A_Media Devices Corporation*, 662 F.3d 1221 (Fed. Cir.
 24 2011), the Federal Circuit reversed the district court’s denial of transfer despite the fact
 25 that the defendant seeking transfer was incorporated in the plaintiff’s chosen forum
 26 years before the lawsuit was filed. *Id.* at 1223-24 (reversing the district court’s denial
 27 of transfer and finding “inappropriate” the district court’s “heavy reliance” on the
 28 defendant’s long-standing location of incorporation in the lawsuit’s original forum)

1 (citing *Koster v. Lumbermens Mut. Cas. Co.*, 330 U.S. 518, 527-528, 67 S.Ct. 828
 2 (1947) (the “[p]lace of corporate domicile in such circumstances might be entitled to
 3 little consideration under the doctrine of forum non-conveniens, which resists
 4 formalization and looks to *the realities* for doing justice.” (emphasis supplied)). Here,
 5 the reality is that plaintiff Unwired Planet LLC’s organization in Nevada – which
 6 occurred virtually simultaneously with Unwired Planet LLC’s filing of this lawsuit –
 7 and non-party Unwired Planet, Inc.’s recent “move” to Nevada – the extent of which
 8 remains unclear – are “recent, ephemeral, and an artifact of litigation,” and should be
 9 given no weight in the transfer analysis whatsoever. *See also Hertz Corp.*, 559 U.S.
 10 77, 130 S.Ct. at 1194 (holding that “nothing more than a mail drop box, a bare office
 11 with a computer, or the location of an annual executive retreat” cannot constitute a
 12 corporation’s “nerve center”).

13 **2. The Contacts Relating to the Causes of Action Are Located in the
 14 Northern District of California**

15 The Ninth Circuit finds transfer appropriate where there is “[n]o significant
 16 connection between [the forum] and the facts alleged in the complaint.” *See, e.g.*,
 17 *Ventress v. Japan Airlines*, 486 F.3d 1111, 1118 (9th Cir. 2007). Here, there is no
 18 connection – significant or otherwise – between Nevada and any of the facts alleged in
 19 the Complaint.

20 As explained above, Plaintiff Unwired Planet LLC has accused Apple of
 21 infringing ten patents. Compl. ¶ 27. All of the events, and hence contacts, relating to
 22 the development of the alleged inventions claimed in the Asserted Patents occurred
 23 outside of this District, and predominately in the Northern District of California. First,
 24 as noted above, Unwired Planet, Inc. was located in Northern California (*id.* ¶¶ 7-11,
 25 Exs. 3-7) when all of the applications underlying the Asserted Patents were filed
 26 (between 1996 and 2008). Compl. ¶¶ 15-24. (Plaintiff Unwired Planet LLC did not
 27 exist.) Second, according to the cover page of each of the Asserted Patents, at the time
 28 the patents were filed nearly all of the named inventors resided in the Northern District

1 of California. *See* Wallace Decl. ¶ 17. The patents identify the remaining inventors as
 2 being from Washington, Colorado, and Ireland. *Id.* Taken together, the location of the
 3 companies and inventors demonstrate that all of the engineering work or product
 4 development that led or relates to the patents occurred *outside of this District*, and
 5 predominately in the Northern District of California. Similarly, and also as explained
 6 above, most of the attorneys who prosecuted the patent applications are also located in
 7 Northern California. *See id.* ¶¶ 17, 19. No activity related to the prosecution of the
 8 Asserted Patents occurred in Nevada.

9 Additionally, the relevant events, and hence contacts, related to the accused
 10 products occurred outside of this District and *in the Northern District of California*.
 11 Specifically, the research, design, and development work related to the relevant aspects
 12 of Apple’s accused products occurred or is occurring in Northern California –not in
 13 Nevada. Buckley Decl. ¶¶ 4, 6. The engineers and documents related to that work,
 14 therefore, are located within the Northern District of California. *Id.* And although
 15 Apple sells the accused products nationwide, there is no indication that Apple
 16 specifically targets customers in Nevada over customers in other states, so that
 17 “connection” cannot outweigh the lack of connection in every other respect.² *See In re*
 18 *TS Tech USA Corp.*, 551 F.3d 1315, 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (holding sale of product in
 19 district does not create local interest because product sold nationwide); *Lycos, Inc.*, 499
 20 F. Supp. 2d at 692 (E.D. Va. 2007) (“Lycos notes that Virginia’s residents purchase
 21 and use allegedly infringing products, method, and systems from the defendants.
 22 However, the defendants likely have this same contact with every other state in this
 23 nation.”); *In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.*, 545 F.3d 304, 318 (5th Cir. 2008)

26 ² While Apple’s subsidiary, Braeburn Capital – an asset management firm – is based in Nevada, it
 27 has no involvement with the patent infringement issues relevant to this lawsuit. Buckley Decl.
 28 ¶ 8. Similarly, based on Apple’s understanding of the accused products and functions in this
 case, Apple’s current retail stores and/or plans to build a data center in Nevada in the future have
 no bearing on the patent infringement issues. *Id.* ¶¶ 9-10.

1 (disregarding local interest of citizens who used the widely sold product within the
 2 transferor venue).

3 Clearly, the Northern District of California possesses a far greater relationship to
 4 the causes of action than this District.

5 **3. Ease of Access to Sources of Proof Strongly Favors the Northern
 6 District of California**

7 Given that the contacts relating to the causes of action in this case are located in
 8 Northern California, it is no surprise that the ease-of-access-to-sources-of-proof factor
 9 *overwhelmingly* favors transfer to the Northern District of California.

10 First, as the Federal Circuit has recognized, in patent infringement cases, “the
 11 bulk of the relevant evidence usually comes from the accused infringer. Consequently,
 12 the place where the defendant’s documents are kept weighs in favor of transfer to that
 13 location.” *In re Genentech, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 1338, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (quoting *Neil
 14 Bros. Ltd. v. World Wide Lines, Inc.*, 425 F. Supp. 2d 325, 330 (E.D.N.Y. 2006)).

15 Courts in the Ninth Circuit have held that “[i]n patent infringement actions, the
 16 preferred forum is ‘that which is the center of gravity of the accused activity.’” *GPNE
 17 Corp. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, No. 11-00426 SOM-RLP, 2012 WL 1656923, at *5 (D.
 18 Haw. May 9, 2012) (quoting *Ricoh Co., Ltd. v. Honeywell, Inc.*, 817 F. Supp. 473, 482
 19 n.17 (D.N.J. 1993)). Here, as explained, Apple is headquartered in Northern
 20 California, the development of the accused products occurred or is occurring in
 21 Northern California, and the relevant documents therefore also are located in Northern
 22 California.³ Buckley Decl. ¶¶ 4, 6. Likewise, Apple’s marketing, finance, and sales
 23 employees who might be witnesses in this case are located in Northern California. *See*

26 ³ The Court should consider the physical location of evidence, even where some of
 27 the evidence is stored electronically. *In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.*, 545 F.3d at
 28 316 (“That access to some sources of proof presents a lesser inconvenience now
 than it might have absent recent developments does not render this factor
 superfluous.”); *In re Genentech, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 1338, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (same).

1 *id.* Indeed, in the ITC Investigation, as noted, all of Apple’s witnesses and documents
 2 were produced out of the Northern District of California.

3 Consequently, litigation in the District of Nevada would impose additional costs
 4 on Apple and require its witnesses to spend additional time away from their regular
 5 employment than would otherwise be required if the case were prosecuted in the
 6 Northern District of California. *See In re Nintendo Co., Ltd.*, 589 F.3d 1194, 1199
 7 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (quoting *In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.*, 545 F.3d at 317 (“Additional
 8 distance [from home] means additional travel time; additional travel time increases the
 9 probability for meal and lodging expenses; and additional travel time with overnight
 10 stays increases the time these fact witnesses must be away from their regular
 11 employment.”)). Indeed, courts in the Ninth Circuit have held that the “inconvenience
 12 to witnesses is sometimes considered *the most important factor* in determining whether
 13 a transfer of venue is appropriate.” *GPNE Corp.*, 2012 WL 1656923, at *3 (citing
 14 *Saleh v. Titan Corp.*, 361 F. Supp. 2d 1152, 1160 (S.D. Cal. 2005)) (emphasis
 15 supplied); *Ruiz v. Affinity Logistics*, No. C 05-02015JSW, 2005 WL 5490240, at *8
 16 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2005).

17 Further, as discussed above, the development by Unwired Planet of the
 18 technology relating to the Asserted Patents occurred while Unwired Planet was located
 19 in Northern California. *Id.* ¶¶ 7-11, Exs. 3-7. And the companies that bought Unwired
 20 Planet’s operating business – Openwave Mobility, Inc. and Openwave Messaging, Inc.
 21 – are still located in Northern California. *Id.* ¶ 24, Exs. 13-14. Thus, it is likely that
 22 any technical witnesses involved in the development of the technology underlying the
 23 patents at issue reside within the Northern District of California. *See id.* ¶ 28, Ex. 18.
 24 Indeed, in the just-concluded case between Unwired Planet and Apple at the U.S.
 25 International Trade Commission, every single one of Unwired Planet’s witnesses who
 26 gave depositions were offered up by Unwired Planet for depositions in Northern
 27 California. *Id.* ¶ 6.

And with respect to the attorneys who prosecuted the patents in suit, today, five of the prosecuting attorneys still reside in Northern California. *Id.* ¶ 19. One lives outside of the district, but within the state of California, in Los Angeles. *Id.* The remaining prosecuting attorneys are in Colorado, Texas, and Washington State. *Id.* None work or reside in Nevada. *See id.* Thus, the sources of proof associated with the prosecution of the Asserted Patents are far more accessible in Northern California than in Nevada.

In cases such as this, where the vast amount of evidence is in the proposed transferee district, transfer is appropriate. *See, e.g., In re Acer Am. Corp.*, 626 F.3d 1252, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (holding that sources-of-proof factor favored transfer where significant portion of evidence was located in the proposed transferee district)

4. Many Non-Party Witnesses Would Be Subject to Compulsory Process in the Northern District of California – None Would Be in the District of Nevada

Because *none* of the foreseeable third-party witnesses are subject to compulsory process in this District, but most would be if this action is transferred to the Northern District of California, this factor weighs heavily in favor of transfer. In fact, as detailed above in Section II.C., if this litigation were to remain in Nevada, Apple would not be able to compel the attendance at trial of even one inventor or former prosecution counsel. On the other hand, most of the non-party inventors are located in Northern California (*id.* ¶ 17), as are most of the prosecuting attorneys, none are in Nevada. *Id.* ¶ 19. Moreover, all but one of the individuals accused by Apple of inequitable conduct are located in Northern California; none are located in Nevada. *Id.* ¶ 18. In addition, the former Unwired Planet employees of whom Apple is aware and from whom Apple may seek testimony are also located in Northern California, not Nevada. *Id.* ¶¶ 21-23. Accordingly, the majority of individuals with relevant knowledge are located in Northern California, and therefore, they are subject to compulsory process in the Northern District of California. *See Fed. R. Civ. P.*

1 45(b)(2). And *none* of them are located within 100 miles of the courthouse of the
 2 United States District Court for the District of Nevada in Reno, so *none* of them would
 3 be subject to compulsory process in this jurisdiction. *Id.* As such, the location of non-
 4 party witnesses *overwhelmingly* favors transfer.

5 **5. The Cost of Litigation Will Be Far Less in the Northern District of**
 6 **California**

7 It would be far less costly, for reasons set forth in detail above, to litigate this
 8 case in the Northern District of California. First, the vast majority of sources of proof
 9 – including party and non-party documents and witnesses – are located within the
 10 Northern District of California. The travel costs associated with party and non-party
 11 witnesses’ participation in trial, for example, would be much lower in the Northern
 12 District of California, where virtually all of these witnesses are domiciled, than they
 13 would be if this case were tried in the District of Nevada (assuming that the non-party
 14 witnesses even agreed to show up for trial in the District of Nevada in the first place).
 15 *In re Verizon Bus. Network Servs.*, 635 F.3d 559, 561 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (where it was
 16 undisputed that no witnesses resided within 100 miles of the transferor district,
 17 transferring the case would “significantly” reduce the cost, time and expense of travel).

18 **6. Unwired Planet’s Choice of Forum Is Entitled to Little, If Any,**
 19 **Weight**

20 A plaintiff’s choice of forum is “far from absolute,” even in situations in which
 21 the plaintiff has strong and long-standing ties to that forum. *See Lockman Found. v.*
 22 *Evangelical Alliance Mission*, 930 F.2d 764, 767 (9th Cir. 1991). What matters in the
 23 transfer analysis is where the operative facts occurred, and therefore “[i]f the operative
 24 facts have not occurred within the forum of original selection and that forum has no
 25 particular interest in the parties or the subject matter, the plaintiff’s choice is entitled
 26 only to minimal consideration.” *Pac. Car & Foundry Co. v. Pence*, 403 F.2d 949, 954
 27 (9th Cir. 1968); *see also GPNE Corp. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 2012 WL 1656923, at *5
 28 (“Where the action has little connection with the chosen forum, less deference is

afforded to plaintiff's choice, even if plaintiff is a resident of the forum."'). "In patent infringement, the preferred forum is 'that which is the center of gravity of the accused activity.' The district court 'ought to be as close as possible to the milieu of the infringing device and the hub of activity centered around its production.'" *GPNE Corp.*, 2012 WL 1656923, at *5 (citations omitted).

Here, as also described in detail above, virtually all of the operative facts – including the development of the alleged inventions, the prosecution of the Asserted Patents, and the development of the accused products – occurred in the Northern District of California, rather than in the District of Nevada. *See Section III.B.2, supra.* The fact that the accused products may be sold in the District of Nevada – just as they are in every other judicial district in the country, including in the Northern District of California – is not persuasive in the transfer analysis. *See Lycos*, 499 F. Supp. 2d at 692 ("It is well-settled that the mere existence of limited sales activity within Virginia does not require this court to give the plaintiff's choice of forum substantial weight when balancing the convenience and justice factors. . . . Moreover, the fact that Virginia's residents use the purportedly infringing products, methods, and systems avails Lycos nothing, as Lycos is not suing those residents in this action."); *Osteotech, Inc. v. GenSci Regeneration Scis., Inc.*, 6 F. Supp. 2d 349, 358 (D.N.J. 1998) (weight is not given to "where limited sales activity has occurred").

Plaintiff Unwired Planet LLC's formation in Nevada and organization under Nevada law just days before the Complaint was filed and Unwired Planet, Inc.'s recent "move" to the District of Nevada should similarly be rejected as bases for resisting transfer. *See In re Microsoft*, 630 F.3d at 1365 (finding transfer appropriate where the plaintiff incorporated in the chosen forum sixteen days before the lawsuit was filed); *Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.*, 769 F. Supp. 2d 991, 995 (E.D. Va. 2011) (finding that plaintiff's choice of forum should be afforded "minimal weight" where plaintiff was formed in the chosen forum five months before it filed the lawsuit). *See also Lycos, Inc.* 499 F. Supp. 2d at 692 (minimizing significance of plaintiff's alleged

1 connection with Virginia, where although plaintiff was incorporated in Virginia,
 2 Virginia's laws of incorporation were irrelevant to the lawsuit). Indeed, Unwired
 3 Planet, Inc.'s CEO publicly admitted that these efforts were litigation driven. *See*
 4 Wallace Decl. ¶ 15, Ex. 11.

5 **C. The Applicable Public Factors Favor Transfer**

6 The local interest of the Northern District of California in having localized
 7 controversies decided at home is strong here, where virtually all of the causes of action
 8 and most of the applicable witnesses are located in that forum. *See Sections II.B.2-3,*
 9 *supra*. Unwired Planet's formation in Nevada just before filing this lawsuit does not
 10 change the fact that this case involves two companies with deep roots in Northern
 11 California, patents that were developed and prosecuted in Northern California, and
 12 accused products that were developed in Northern California.

13 Given the close relationship of the controversies involved in this lawsuit with
 14 the Northern District of California and their utter lack of relationship to Nevada, it
 15 would be unfair to burden the citizens of Nevada with jury duty for this case. This is
 16 particularly acute in this lawsuit, as it will likely require a lengthy trial, given that
 17 Unwired Planet has chosen to assert ten different patents and accuse at least fifteen
 18 different products of infringement. Compl. ¶¶ 15-24, 27.

19 **D. The Remaining Private and Public Factors Are Neutral or Not Applicable**

20 All of the remaining private and public factors – the location where the relevant
 21 agreements were negotiated and executed, the state that is most familiar with the
 22 governing law, the administrative difficulties flowing from court congestion, the
 23 interest in having the trial of a diversity case in a forum that is at home with the law
 24 that must govern the action, and the avoidance of unnecessary problems in conflict of
 25 laws or in the application of foreign law – are either neutral or not applicable to this
 26 lawsuit, and therefore do not affect the transfer calculus.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Apple respectfully requests that the Court grant this Motion and transfer this case, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), to the United States District for the Northern District of California.

DATED: February 1, 2013

By: /s/ Jonathan W. Fountain
Jonathan W. Fountain
Nevada Bar No. 10351
JFountain@LRLaw.com
LEWIS AND ROCA LLP
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Ste. 600
Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996
Tel.: 702.949.8340
Fax: 702.949.8374

E. Leif Reid
Nevada Bar No. 5750
LReid@LRLaw.com
LEWIS AND ROCA LLP
50 West Liberty St., Ste. 410
Reno, NV 89501-1922
Tel.: 775.321.3415
Fax: 775.823.2929

Josh Krevitt (admitted *pro hac vice*)
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166-0193
Tel.: 212.351.4000
Fax: 212.351.4035

H. Mark Lyon (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Y. Ernest Hsin (admitted *pro hac vice*)
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1881 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1211
Tel.: 650.849.5300
Fax: 650.849.5333

Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.

101447325.5

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, hereby certify that on February 1, 2013, I filed a true and accurate copy of the foregoing document entitled, **DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1414(a)**, with the Clerk of the Court via the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send electronic notice of the same to the following CM/ECF participants:

- Theodore Stevenson III (tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com);
- Kevin L. Burgess (kburgess@mckoolsmith.com);
- Pierre J. Hubert (phubert@mckoolsmith.com);
- Michael D. Rounds (mrounds@watsonrounds.com); and
- Adam K. Yowell (ayowell@watsonrounds.com)

Dated: this 1st day of February, 2013.

/s/ Jonathan W. Fountain

An employee of Lewis and Roca LLP